

6. (Amended) A method of updating a master copy of a geographic database comprising:

obtaining a report relating to at least one geographic feature of a geographic location;

obtaining a satellite image of the geographic location;

analyzing the satellite image to determine how to update the master copy of the geographic database; and

updating the master copy of the geographic database.

30. (New) A method of updating a geographic database including data that represents geographic features in a geographic region comprising:

obtaining a report indicating a location corresponding to data inaccurately representing the geographic feature in the geographic region;

obtaining a satellite image of the location;

analyzing the satellite image to determine a correction to the data, said correction to the data accurately representing the geographic feature; and

updating the geographic database with the correction.

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed September 26, 2002. In the Office Action, Applicants' Claims 1, 6-8, 10-11, 13, 16-20 and 22-29 were rejected as obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Pat. No. 5,864,632 ("Ogawa") and Washington Post webpage ("Traffic"). Applicants' Claims 2-4 were rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Ogawa and Traffic and in further view of "GDF, A Proposed Standard for Digital Road Maps" ("Heres"). Applicants' Claim 5 was rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Ogawa and Traffic and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,317,081 ("Stilp"). Applicants' Claim 9 was rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Ogawa and Traffic and in further view of "Sources of Satellite Imagery" ("Fowler"). Applicants' Claim 12 was rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Ogawa and Traffic and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,072 ("Truong"). Applicants' Claim 14-15 was rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Ogawa and Traffic and in

further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,099,331 ("Truong"). Applicants' Claim 21 was rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Ogawa and Traffic and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,143 ("Peschke").

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the present application in view of the amendment and remarks. Applicants submit that all the pending claims in the present application are allowable over the cited references.

I. Pending Claims

Applicants' independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is not obvious in view of the combination of Ogawa and Traffic because the combination does not disclose or suggest all of the recited claim elements of Claim 1. Specifically, independent Claim 1 recites "obtaining satellite images of areas based upon reports about errors in data that represent geographic features located in said areas." Applicants' independent Claim 1 distinguishes the combination of Ogawa and Traffic because neither of these references discloses or suggests this claim element.

First, as stated in the Office Action, Ogawa fails to disclose or suggest obtaining satellite images of areas based upon reports about errors in data that represent geographic features located in the areas. (*See*, Office Action: page 3). Second, Traffic also fails to disclose or suggest reports about errors in data that represent geographic features located in the areas. In contrast, Traffic merely discloses a report of current traffic conditions provided by cameras, spotter planes, federal and state officials and commuters who report traffic problems. (*See*, Traffic: page 1, paragraph 2). Traffic's report does not provide errors in data that represent geographic features; rather, Traffic's report only provides traffic conditions. Traffic conditions are information regarding a travel time and travel speed of a plurality of vehicles traveling through the region. Thus, Traffic's report fails to disclose or suggest the claim element of reports about errors in data that represent geographic features. Because the combination of Ogawa and Traffic does not disclose or suggest the claim element of obtaining satellite images of areas based upon reports about errors in data that represent geographic features located in the areas, Applicants' independent Claim 1 is not obvious over this combination of references.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Ogawa with Traffic, as required for the obvious rejection. If a proposed modification would render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. (*See*, M.P.E.P. § 2143.01). In fact, the modification of Ogawa to use Traffic's reports to obtain images would render Ogawa unsatisfactory for its intended purpose of updating the three-dimensional digital map of the geographic region. Because traffic congestion typically repeats at certain times along certain roadways, using Traffic's reports would cause the Ogawa system to continually obtain the same images and to never obtain images of regions that lack traffic congestion. Using Traffic's reports would only allow the Ogawa system to update a small portion of the map of the geographic region. Thus, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Ogawa with Traffic, and Applicants' independent Claim 1 is not obvious.

Applicants' independent Claim 6

Claim 6 is not obvious in view of the combination of Ogawa and Traffic because the combination does not disclose or suggest all of the recited claim elements of Claim 6. Specifically, independent Claim 6 recites "obtaining a report relating to at least one geographic feature of a geographic location and obtaining a satellite image of the geographic location." Applicants' independent Claim 6 distinguishes the combination of Ogawa and Traffic because neither of these references discloses or suggests these claim elements.

First, as stated in the Office Action, Ogawa fails to disclose or suggest the satellite images of areas is obtained based upon reports about errors in data that represent geographic features located in the areas. (*See*, Office Action: page 4). Second, Traffic also fails to disclose or suggest a report relating to at least one geographic feature. In contrast, Traffic merely discloses a report of current traffic conditions provided by cameras, spotter planes, federal and state officials and commuters who report traffic problems. (*See*, Traffic: page 1, paragraph 2). Traffic's report does not provide the report relating to at least one geographic feature; rather, Traffic's report only provides traffic conditions. Traffic conditions are information regarding a travel time and travel speed of a plurality of vehicles traveling through the region. Thus, Traffic's report fails

to disclose or suggest the claim element of a report relating to at least one geographic feature. Because the combination of Ogawa and Traffic does not disclose or suggest the claim elements of obtaining a report relating to at least one geographic feature of a geographic location and obtaining a satellite image of the geographic location, Applicants' independent Claim 6 is not obvious over this combination of references.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Ogawa with Traffic, as described above in conjunction with Claim 1, to render Claim 6 obvious.

Applicants' new independent Claim 30

New claim 30 is patentable over the cited references because the cited references do not disclose or suggest all of the recited claim elements of Claim 30.

Applicants' dependent Claims 2-5 and 7-29

Applicants' Claims 2-5 and 7-29 are dependent claims that distinguish the cited references at least for the same reasons explained above in connection with their independent base Claims 1 and 6. In addition, these claims recite further features and limitations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by these references.

II. Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

Accompanying this response is a Second Information Disclosure Statement including an authorization for payment of fee associated therewith.

III. Extension of Time

Accompanying this response is a petition for an extension of time including an authorization for payment of fee associated therewith.

II. Conclusion

All the issues in the Office Action, dated September 26, 2002 have been addressed. Favorable consideration of the present application is requested. If any issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Jon D. Shutter
Reg. No. 41,311
Patent Counsel

NAVIGATION TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 894-7000 x7365

IN THE CLAIMS (marked-up version):

Please amend Claim 6 as indicated.

Please add new Claim 30.

6. (Amended) A method of updating a master copy of a geographic database comprising:

obtaining a report relating to at least one geographic feature of a geographic location;

obtaining a satellite image of the geographic location;

analyzing the satellite image to determine how to update the master copy of the geographic database; and

updating the master copy of the geographic database.

30. (New) A method of updating a geographic database including data that represents geographic features in a geographic region comprising:

obtaining a report indicating a location corresponding to data inaccurately representing the geographic feature in the geographic region;

obtaining a satellite image of the location;

analyzing the satellite image to determine a correction to the data, said correction to the data accurately representing the geographic feature; and

updating the geographic database with the correction.